

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,024	10/19/2001	Ercan E. Kuruoglu	110915	7124
27074	7590	08/25/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/982,024

Applicant(s)

KURUOGLU ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1/2/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2178

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application, and IDS filed on 10/19/2001, and 1/2/2002.

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. Claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1, and 8 are independent claims.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/2/2002 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings filed on 10/19/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5, and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mahoney et al, hereinafter Mahoney (Pat.# 5,659,639 , 8/19/1997).

Regarding independent claim 1, Mahoney discloses receiving a document with an input image set, with editing marks via a scanner—*capturing an image of a document* -- (col. 12, lines 18-30, 48-67).

Moreover, Mahoney discloses a scanner for detecting or distinguishing editing marks from a graphical feature in the document—*detecting the annotations which were made to the document before or prior to capture* -- (col. 12, lines 18-30, 48-67, col.14, lines 46-59, fig.4).

Furthermore, Mahoney discloses the output of a version of the scanned document in which the editing operation, such as deleting a feature using the editing marks, have been performed—*generating a summary of a document based on the detected annotations* -- (col. 12, lines 1-30, 48-67, col.14, lines 46-59, fig.1, 4).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses the output of an version of the scanned document in which the editing operation, such as deleting a feature using the editing marks made on the same document, have been performed—*generating a summary of a document based on the detected annotations* -- (col. 12, lines 1-30, 48-67, col.14, lines 46-59, fig.1, 4).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses the output of an version of the scanned document in which the editing operation, such as deleting a feature using the editing marks made on a different overlay document, have been performed (col. 12, lines 1-30, 48-67, col.14, lines 16-45, fig.1, 4).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses the output of an version of the scanned document in which the editing operation, such as deleting a feature using the editing marks made on a different overlay document—*annotations in the first document*--, have been performed (col. 12, lines 1-30, 48-67, col.14, lines 16-45, fig.1, 4).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses the output of an version of the scanned document in which the editing operation, such as deleting a feature using the editing marks made next to that feature—*image region associated with a detected annotation* -- (col. 11, lines 40-col.12, lines 30, 48-67, col.14, lines 46-59, fig.1, 4).

Claims 8-12 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1-5 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6-7, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney, in view of Kurosawa et al, hereinafter Kurosawa (Pat. # 6,751,779 B1, 6/15/04, filed on 3/20/2000).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Mahoney discloses the output of an version of the scanned document in which the editing operation, such as deleting a feature using the editing marks made next to that feature—*image region associated with a detected annotation* -- (col. 11, lines 40-col.12, lines 30, 48-67, col.14, lines 46-59, fig.1, 4). Mahoney fails to explicitly disclose: *the image region represents a sentence in the document image to provide context for the identified annotation*. However, Kurosawa teaches the deleting of a series of characters located in document lines, by a user crossing out the lines to be canceled or deleted from a document (col.15, lines 3-57, fig. 19, 26), where the marked-up character series indicate what is to be canceled or providing context for the marks. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combined Mahoney, and Kurosawa, because Kurosawa teaches the reducing of burdens put upon an editor of a document, by using simple operations (col. 1, lines 59-67, and col.2, lines 28-53).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Mahoney discloses the output of an version of the scanned document in which the editing operation, such as deleting a feature using the editing marks made next to that feature- (col. 11, lines 40-col.12, lines 30, 48-67, col.14, lines 46-59, fig.1, 4). Mahoney fails to explicitly disclose: *a summary comprising portions which are selectively expandable to increase the information in that portion of the summary*. However, Kurosawa teaches the inserting of a series of characters located in document lines into a document (col.6, lines 40-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combined Mahoney, and Kurosawa, because Kurosawa teaches

Art Unit: 2178

the reducing of burdens put upon an editor of a document, by using simple operations (col. 1, lines 59-67, and col.2, lines 28-53).

Claims 13-14 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 6-7 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kupiec (Pat. # 6,533,822), Witbrock et al (Pat. # 6,317,708).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5543 ( (571) 272-2148 as of 10/12/04)**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (703) 308-5465 ( (571) 272-4124 as of 10/12/04). However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Art Unit: 2178

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**



CESAR B PAULA

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2178

8/23/04